ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: <u>728-241 (YOR920030583US1)</u>

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

APPLICANT(S): LEVAS, Anthony et al. GROUP ART UNIT: 2626

APPLICATION NO.: 10/797,847 EXAMINER: JACKSON, Jakieda R.

FILING DATE: March 10, 2004 **DATED:** May 6, 2010

FOR: A SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PRESENTING

AND BROWSING INFORMATION

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF

REPLY

Appellants respectfully submit the following as a reply to the arguments contained in the

Examiner's Answer dated April 1, 2010.

The claims of the present application recite, in one form or another, directional tagging of

classified information with directional tags for spatial presentation, and consulting the directional

tags to audibly present each class from a different position in space relative to a user and based

on the directional tags. A directional tag controls the location in space from which the classified

information is presented to a user. See Specification at pages 5-8 for an explanation of the

direction tag. A directional tag is independent from a location of a user, that is, the different

position in space from which the information is presented is both relative to a user and based on

the directional tags. The Examiner alleges that the combination of Kovesdi and Willins discloses

these features.

As was argued in Appellants' Brief on Appeal, Kovesdi utilizes various 2-dimensional

visual displays to indicate the location of physical objects that have been represented by

machine-readable object identifiers, e.g. a Radio Frequency Identifier (RFID) tag. 1 The device in

Kovesdi displays the location of an object based on the orientation of the device. Willins teaches

a system where audio is output from a headset connected to a mobile terminal,² the headset

See Kovesdi at FIGs. 1 and 2.
See Willins at Abstract.

2

Attorney Docket No.: 728-241 (YOR920030583US1)

includes a compass to determine the head orientation of a user.³ Willins uses the head orientation

of the user to determine how sound is output. The Examiner concedes that Willins teaches that

based on the geographical position of the user and user's orientation, the terminal plays an audio

clip describing what the user is directly viewing.⁴

The directional tagging of the claims of the present application define from where the

sound is to emanate, whereas the combination of Kovesdi and Willins produces a device that

produces sound from a position in space based on the location of a user.

Thus, the combination of Kovesdi and Willins cannot render the claims of the present

application unpatentable.

As the Examiner has failed to make out a prima facie case for an obviousness rejection,

the rejection of Claims 1, 5-9, 13-18 and 22-26 must be reversed.

It is well settled that in order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be appropriate,

the claimed invention must be shown to be obvious in view of the prior art as a whole. A claim

may be found to be obvious if it is first shown that all of the recitations of a claim are taught in

the prior art or are suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 985, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580,

583 (C.C.P.A. 1974), cited in M.P.E.P. §2143.03.

³ See Willins at Abstract.

⁴ See Answer at page 7.

3

Attorney Docket No.: <u>728-241 (YOR920030583US1)</u>

The Examiner has failed to show that all of the recitations of Claims 1, 5-9, 13-18 and 22-26 are taught or suggested by Kovesdi in view of Willins.

Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to make out a prima facie case for an obviousness rejection. Therefore, the rejections of Claims 1, 5-9, 13-18 and 22-26 must be reversed.

Dated: May 6, 2010

Paul J. Farrell Reg. No.: 34,494

Attorney for Appellants

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, LLP 290 Broadhollow Road, Suite 210 E Melville, New York 11747

Tel: (516) 228-3565 Fax: (516) 228-8475